

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

APR 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

ORIGINAL

Docket # 05-271
219 Letters Received

Addressed to: Chairman Martin & Commissioners

Written

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

erik.lentz@gmail.com wrote on 3/23/2006 7:51:08 PM :

Dear Mr. Martin,

American Telcos cannot be allowed to create a multi-tiered internet. Consumers already pay for their bandwidth, and content providers already pay for their bandwidth. Downgrading services and forcing them to pay a second time to have normal access is ridiculous.

The government allows the Telcos to provide the services they do, and to lay the lines that they lay, and to hold the relative monopolies that they hold under the assumption of public good and that they will be common carriers, completely ambivalent to what is being sent on the lines.

Moreover, the government creates tax and other incentives to benefit to Telcos to encourage the creation of modern fiber networks and other advancement. These benefits were given to the Telcos with promises of services which have yet to be delivered. Further lining the pockets of the Telcos by allowing this tiered internet is unacceptable.

Thank you,
Erik Lentz

~~05-271~~
05-271
RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

03/27/06

~~05/15/06~~

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Dan Carmody [dcarmody@satx.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 30, 2006 2:35 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dan Carmody (dcarmody@satx.rr.com) writes:

It won't surprise me considering the amount of money being spent by the RBOC on lobbying YOU and your fellow commissioners but i would hope you would resist their temptations and remember who it is you are sworn in to serve and protect, the consumers. Internet Neutrality is important to people like me, self employed, top tier taxpayer (sorry but no PAC money for you, just my taxes!!), mobile and on the go with laptop and SIP phones in hand. Just how much control are you going to give the giant duopolies Cable and RBOC over content? Are they going to charge and shuffle ALL service providers from online streaming charts for traders, to shopping stores, blogospheres, music stations, and other voice or video service providers??? I think it is incredibly arrogant and obnoxious of the RBOC as it is to basically bribe our entire legislative body leaving the masses completely out of the debate. Your body seems to think that a duopoly is good enough level of competition but far from your loop the silent and bewildered masses feel pinched, stuck in the middle, confused, and ripped off by these so called "value added" industries. Please vote in favor of net neutrality on behalf of the consumers which you represent. Thank you for your time.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 71.33.237.88
Remote IP address: 71.33.237.88

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED RECEIVED

Sandra Lyn Bailey

APR - 3 2006

Sent: Saturday, March 25, 2006 3:45 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

65-271

Objector () writes:

You cannot ruin the internet like this: history will not remember you fondly.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 65.93.174.71
Remote IP address: 65.93.174.71

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Sandra Lyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Aaron Belenky [abelenky@alum.mit.edu]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:36 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Aaron Belenky (abelenky@alum.mit.edu) writes:

I understand that earlier this week in a speech before TelecomNext, you supported the idea of a "tiered" internet. This is something most internet users view as extortion and completely unacceptable.

Each web-service pays for their hosting and bandwidth provider, and each end customer pays for their ISP and service (cable-modem, DSL, or dialup). Further costs from intermediate links to end-providers or users are not appropriate and would be seriously damaging to innovation, creativity and openness.

Please re-consider your ill-informed position.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 24.19.201.217
Remote IP address: 24.19.201.217

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Aaron M. Harris [maelgad@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:07 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Aaron M. Harris (maelgad@yahoo.com) writes:

Having perused your recent comments about a 'tiered-internet' I was livid. I find the idea destructive at the least, and motivated by greed over service value at the best. Taking your notion, clearly the phone companies should also be able to provide their best lines to the people that pay a premium on their phone service while giving their worst lines, the ones with the most static, to their lower paying customers. The internet is a utility in this day and age. Like the electricity, gas, and water that flows into homes it is more and more a necessary expense. Your predecessors were clearly more aware of the position of your office to /serve the public interest/ than you appear to be. It is sad that this country has become so much more about corporate greed and corporate welfare than about doing what is best for the people who live in it. But I suppose their favor does not do as much to secure a cushy job after leaving public service.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.188.93.97
Remote IP address: 68.188.93.97

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Aaron Macom [acmacom@ovnet.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 9:16 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Aaron Macom (acmacom@ovnet.com) writes:

I do not want a tiered internet.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 69.43.7.241
Remote IP address: 69.43.7.241

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: Aaron Yaw [ayaw@twcnny.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:11 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Aaron Yaw (ayaw@twcnny.rr.com) writes:

I strongly oppose the recent decision to allow service providers to "tier" the internet. This decision allows the companies to not only charge the residential customers for access, it allows them to back-charge anyone that wants to reach their customers. The customer is no longer paying for access to the internet, they're paying for whom-so-ever their ISP wants them to reach. I believe you're forgetting that most of America is not New York City. The majority of Americans have only a single choice for a high speed internet connection. It's a much smaller percentage that actually can choose between two providers. You're allowing the providers to control the content that their customers are paying for. It's essentially creating a system for bribery. Content providers will be forced to pay the bribes for their material to reach the people. And since the FCC has twice decided that cable ISPs do not need to open their networks, and has given phone companies the back door of using fiber on their networks to keep out other providers, the customers will have no choice. There are no competing providers, so if your ISP hasn't recieved their monthly bribe, then customers have no way to access the content they want to. The decision to allow tiering of the internet is sheer greed. There is no practical reason to allow this other than to allow the New-Age Bells to pad their pockets from both ends of the connection.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 24.59.74.238
Remote IP address: 24.59.74.238

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Adam Dane [tinder@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 1:16 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Adam Dane (tinder@bellsouth.net) writes:

The recent decision to allow the ISPs to charge major web properties for bandwidth that is already paid for by the consumers is nothing short of a violation of the right to free speech.

I hope you realize that you will be written into the history books for your decisions when acting as a civil servant. Your most important role as the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission is to serve the people, and this decision does not do that in any shape, form, or fashion.

I seriously hope you will reconsider this ludicrous decision before it costs us all a lot of money in the courts, and ends up getting overturned.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.159.172.67
Remote IP address: 68.159.172.67

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: Alex Trent [xeodeus@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:35 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Alex Trent (xeodeus@gmail.com) writes:

How much is the big phone companies paying you? It has to be at least six figures, or do you get a percentage of the tax they will put on internet websites? I hope I see the day when corrupt politicians like you are no longer allowed to be bought by large companies and instead will finally have to actually represent the people. It's a scary thought isn't it?

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 65.33.92.198
Remote IP address: 65.33.92.198

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Andrew Hallock [andrew.hallock@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 9:55 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Andrew Hallock (andrew.hallock@gmail.com) writes:

I think the idea of a tiered Internet is not in the best interest of the people, and is not conducive to growth and innovation.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 67.39.101.18
Remote IP address: 67.39.101.18

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Aru Sahni [aru@jhu.edu]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:29 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Aru Sahni (aru@jhu.edu) writes:

Dear Mr. Martin,

I write to voice my disagreement with your comments regarding tiering the Internet and your view on net neutrality. I believe that, by allowing companies to charge websites for providing "adequate" bandwidth, you stifle American innovation and progress. How many of today's websites and online services would not have come to be if there was a tiered internet? Free sites and services like Flickr, Digg, Wikipedia, etc. wouldn't have been able to afford an additional fee on top of their existing bandwidth charges.

I feel that the Internet best serves the world when it is open. Doing anything to "regulate" its openness is a step in the wrong direction, and can only end up stifling innovation. Sincerely, ~Aru Sahni

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 128.220.89.178
Remote IP address: 128.220.89.178

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Ben Campbell [bl.campbell@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 3:06 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Ben Campbell (bl.campbell@comcast.net) writes:

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I do not support tiered internet service as it will stifle innovation and only serve to raise costs across the board. Current internet access will stay the same price, and internet access with higher bandwidth will just cost more than it currently does. This is just a boon to telecoms. Its a terrible mistake. When the government gets into utilites like this, they only serve to raise prices and give money to businesses. Stay out of the tiered internet business!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.74.144.100
Remote IP address: 64.74.144.100

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: Bill Matherly [bill.matherly.jr@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 9:09 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Bill Matherly (bill.matherly.jr@gmail.com) writes:

Would like to speak out against a the proposed tier internet by telco companies.

Allowing them to charge others to bring content to their subscribers opens another can of worms. What would then stop them from blocking users from using competing VoIP products. Absurd you think? Guess what you endorse this movement, you also endorsing them to start monopolizing services telephone since they will block VoIP connections, and it gives cable companies the ability to block video on demand subscription services. This will only prove to be a bad precedence. Please reconsider your stance on this issue and you will agree that this is simply not fair at all.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.228.174.213
Remote IP address: 68.228.174.213

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Bob Spaulding [bspaulding@nespower.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:36 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Bob Spaulding (bspaulding@nespower.com) writes:

Mr Martin:

I am dismayed by your remarks re: a "tiered" internet system which would allow providers to charge users not directly connected to their pipes.

I strongly suggest you research the term "Peering Agreement" to gain a basic understanding of this issue.

The major players (google, yahoo, et.al.) already pay huge fees for high speed access with their preferred provider. Allowing other telco's to extort major users for high speed transport simply because the packets are crossing "their" networks is double charging and flatly wrong.

Bob Spaulding

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 216.248.21.14
Remote IP address: 216.248.21.14

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Bob Spircoff [SithBob@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 1:02 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Bob Spircoff (SithBob@hotmail.com) writes:

The FCC's support of the large telecoms "Tierd Internet" is troubling, and will lead to an increased prince burden on the consumer. This bothers me greatly, and will lead to no good for the future.

Thank you for your time,

Bob Spircoff

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 134.48.22.154
Remote IP address: 134.48.22.154

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Branden McIntyre [branden.mcintyre@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 8:55 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Branden McIntyre (branden.mcintyre@gmail.com) writes:

Chairman Martin,

In response to your recent remarks supporting "tiered" internet access. How can you support extortion at the corporate level? All connections on BOTH sides are already paid for by BOTH the consumer AND the company on the other side. "tiered" internet access is merely extortion and nothing less. The FCC has had some bad ideas in the past, but this is by far the most assinine of them all.

Branden McIntyre
Network Engineer

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 63.126.41.250
Remote IP address: 63.126.41.250

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: Brian [brian@velocitygrafix.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:20 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Brian (brian@velocitygrafix.com) writes:

Have you gone mad??!!? For god's sake protect the pelple from these screwed up telcos!!!!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 199.191.74.20
Remote IP address: 199.191.74.20

Sandralyn Bailey

From: brian fernholz [bf319@med.nyu.edu]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 5:36 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

brian fernholz (bf319@med.nyu.edu) writes:

I think you are taking the wrong approach in allowing Telcos to charge content providers. In essence, they are charging both sides of the internet connection. It seems that you are acting in the corporation's best interest and not the individual's interest.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 216.165.126.102
Remote IP address: 216.165.126.102

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: Brian Pollmann [bpollmann@mchsi.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 1:35 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Brian Pollmann (bpollmann@mchsi.com) writes:

Subject: Tiered internet

Dear Chairman,

I wish to respond to comments you made recently regarding your support of a tiered internet. I do not believe that you are upholding the welfare of the people with such a position.

Currently, the fee structure of internet access charges those that consume content and those that provide it. To allow corporations to charge extra fees or limit bandwidth based on type of traffic or service would hurt the public good. All of these telecommunication companies provide services that they would preferentially promote by restricting competition either financially or by limiting access. Small or new internet companies would not be able to compete in such a climate.

The internet also represents a component of critical infrastructure to the United States. As such, all should have equal access without discrimination imposed by a corporation providing this access.

I sincerely hope that you reconsider your position.

Thank You,

Brian Pollmann

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 66.103.171.170
Remote IP address: 66.103.171.170

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Britt D. Burton [britt.burton@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 10:09 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Britt D. Burton (britt.burton@gmail.com) writes:

Tiered Internet.

Dear Mr. Martin,

I can not express my displeasure strongly enough over your support for a tiered internet as envisioned by AT&T and certain other telecommunications companies.

Currently I pay for my internet access. I pay for my use of broadband, and am limited in the access I get based upon a contract I agreed to digitally. Should a tiered internet plan come into fruition, I will then be charged twice for that same access, once by the telco, then once again by fees added to my use of websites either through advertising or other means.

Your support of this plan merely underscores the Bush plan to run the United States as a playground for the haves, supported by the have nots.

I can not wait to get a new president and see your smiling, smug face working anywhere else but in the public sector. You obviously have no idea what "Public Service" means.

Britt D. Burton... A Naval Scientist, working in the DOD.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 138.162.0.37
Remote IP address: 138.162.0.37

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: Bruce Gutman [bgutz2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:39 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Bruce Gutman (bgutz2@yahoo.com) writes:

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman Martin,

I strongly disagree with your support of Telcos being allowed to charge access fees to web sites and web service providers.

The Internet is a shared, peer-to-peer access network that was founded on the principle of inclusiveness. Anyone who was willing to follow the rules could connect.

Over time, numerous service providers stepped in and provided simpler solutions and eventually it evolved to what it is today.

Giving any group the ability to control it and levy network fees is just wrong. It will stifle new services, hurt small businesses and gradually strangle what is working because a few companies would like to further line their pockets.

If AT&T can't compete fairly, they should find a new business. The Internet belongs to American and world citizens, not stodgy old world companies that lack innovation to create things of value on their own.

Sincerely,
Bruce Gutman

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.125.103.240
Remote IP address: 64.125.103.240

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Bryan Hoffart [mrhappydude@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 5:36 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Bryan Hoffart (mrhappydude@gmail.com) writes:

i think a tier interset system will not be good for america

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 66.37.232.4
Remote IP address: 66.37.232.4

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Carlos Jueves [hmailer2000@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 2:20 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Carlos Jueves (hmailer2000@yahoo.com) writes:

I think that allowing oligarchy telcos and cable operators to charge extra for delivery of content from 3rd parties is a very bad idea.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 131.107.0.103
Remote IP address: 131.107.0.103

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Chris Kelly [fcc.juggler314@9ox.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 1:05 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Chris Kelly (fcc.juggler314@9ox.net) writes:

Allowing ISP's to limit bandwidth to particular sites is a terribly bad idea. The ISP charges for bulk bandwidth delivery - they get paid for every T1, T3, etc that they provide. Allowing them to charge more for bandwidth to particular websites is allowing them to charge an extra fee for no increase in service at all. It would be akin to a telco deciding that because one person gets a huge volume of phone calls they are going to charge an extra penny per minute for all calls to that number. This is not the way the pricing models were developed and it is not the way existing businesses planned for their growth. It also opens all sorts of doors to censorship. What would be stopping an ISP for charging extra to sites that they simply don't agree with? This is a terrible idea.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 67.105.150.233
Remote IP address: 67.105.150.233